O 1 P & CA

TRANSMITTAL

AE 3713 PTO/SB/21 (05-03)

Approval for use through 04/30/2003.	OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT	OF COMMERCE

Oct 12, 2001

Under Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Application Number 09/977,138

Filing Date

FORM	First Named Inventor	Odom, Wayne			
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filin	g) Art Unit	3713			
	Examiner Name	C. Marks			
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	Attorney Docket Number	ODOM01-01			
	ENCLOSURES (check all that ap	ply)			
Fee Transmittal Form	Drawing(s)	, After Allowance Communication to Group Appeal Communication to Board			
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers	of Appeals and Interferences			
Amendment / Reply	Petition	Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)			
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	Proprietary Information			
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Addre	ess Status Letter			
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer	X Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):			
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund	Revised Appeal Brief in Triplicate Copy of Notice of Non-Compliance			
Information Disclosure Statement	CD, Number of CD(s)	Return postcard			
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Remarks	RECEIVED			
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application MAR 2 4 2004					
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	,	TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700			
	ATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY,	OR AGENT			
Firm or Anderson & Morishita, L.L.C. Individual					
Signature Signature					
Date March 15, 2004					
	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/M.	AILING			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.					
Typed or printed name Kellie D. Carr					

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C., 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents. P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Application No. Op/977,138 ODOM ET AL. With 37 CFR 1.192(c) MAR 1 9 2004 Compliance Whith 37 CFR 1.192(c) Examiner C. Marks 3713 The Appeal Brief filed on 09 January 2004 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three **TIME PERIODS**: (1) **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) **TWO MONTHS** from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. **EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1.			e brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the prope ading or in the proper order.	r
2.			e brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify pealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).	/ the
3.			least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a stement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).	
4.			e brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by public diline number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).	page
5.	\boxtimes	The	e brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).	
6.		A s	single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and	
	(a)		the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or for together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.	all
	(b)		the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand of together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.	or fall
7.		The	e brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c	:)(8)).
8.		The	e brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)	(9)).
9.	\boxtimes	Oth	ner (including any explanation in support of the above items):	
		See	e Continuation Sheet	

RECEIVED

MAR 2 4 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

cmm ,

Teresa Walberg / Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3700

Continuation of 9. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items): 1) The status of amendments is incorrect as only amendments after final need be identified in this section. In the present case, there are no such amendments; therefore, nothing should be identified.

- 2) The issues presented are incorrect as there should only be two issues in the case. Issue #1 and #3 are correct as they identify the rejections present. Issues #2 and #4 are merely arguments relating to Issues #1 and #3 and are just a more specific restatement of such and thus are not separate issues at hand, just restatements of previously identified issues.
- 3) The grouping of the claims is also incorrect as there are multiple claims shared among the groups. The grouping should match the issues presented and thus reflect the grouping of the rejections with each claim belonging to one group. There should be two groups wherein Group 1 would include claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-20, 22-30, 32-38 and 40-48 and Group 2 would include claims 5, 15, 21, 31 and 39. If so desired by the Applicant, claims within the group can then be recited to not stand or fall together. If the Applicant desires to make this recitation, each of these claims must be argued as separately patentable in the argument section.